## EXHIBIT B

Document 72-3

Filed 03/24/2004

Page 2 of 3

## WOOD @ LAMPING LLP

SINCE 1927 ATTORNEYS AT LAW

600 VINE STREET, SUTTE 2500 CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-2491 TELEPHONE (513) 852-6000 FAX (513) 852-6087

WOOD, LAMPING & LEHNER LLP 208 WALNUT STREET LAWRENCEBURG INDIANA 47025 TELEPHONE (812) 537-2375 FAX (812) 537-2368

KENNETH J. SCHNEIDER WILLIAM R. ELLIS\*\* WILLIAM H. EDER, JR. HAROLD G. KORBEE ERIC C. HOLZAPFEL PAUL R. BERNINGER ROBERT P. MALLOY JEFFREY M. ROLLMAN MARK S. REÇKMAN JAN M. FRANKEL GARY J. DAVIST JAMES B, HARRISON\* HENRY E. MENNINGER, JR. KAREN A. NIČEWANDER C.J. SCHMIDT, III THOMAS M. WOEBKENBERG V. BRANDON MCGRATH\* V. ARTHUR D. WEBER, JR.\* THOMAS J. BREED

JOHN W. ELIERS LISA D. LEHNER\*\*\* + PETER M. BURRELL++ JEFFREY P. MCSHERRY\* \*\*\* LISA M. RAMMES DOUGLAS L. WESTENDORF ROCCINA S. NIEHAUS TIMOTHY A. GARRY, JR. THOMAS R. BLONDELL+++ EDWARD D. BENDER JANET Y. CASTAÑEDA KEVIN K ERANK ++++ JEFFREY D. FORBES NATHAN H. BLASKE SARAH B. ELLINGTON

Counsel ROBERT F. RECKMAN AMY GASSER CALLOW

Refired HARRY M. HOFFHEIMER

JOHN WOOD II (1917-1998) FRED C. LAMPING (1903-ALBERT H. NEMAN (1929-2003)

'Also Admitted in Kentucky "Also Admitted in Pennsylvania \*\*\*Also Admitted in Indiana

+ Also Admitted in Artzona

++ Also Admitted in Oregon +++ Admitted in Indiana & Illinois ++++ Admitted in California

DIRECT DIAL: (513) 852-6041 E-MAIL: echolzapfel@woodlamping.com

March 23, 2004

## VIA FACSIMILE (216) 274-2514

Steven A. Goldfarb, Esq. Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP 3300 PB Tower 200 Public Square Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2301

> THI v. Govan, Case No. C-1-01-784 RE:

Dear Mr. Goldfarb:

Pursuant to FRCP 45(c)(2)(B), this letter constitutes written objections to the subpoena I received by fax demanding production of my firm's billing records in this case. For the reasons set forth below, we object to the production of such records.

First, regarding your evidence of attorneys fees, I am disappointed that I agreed to extend your time to respond to our objections based on your associate Nancy Oliver's representation that she was going on vacation. Had I known that you needed the additional time in order to serve a subpoena for our records and to review those records prior to responding to our objections, I would not have agreed to the extension.

Second, our billing records are not pertinent to your firm's billings on this case. All that matters is the time and money your firm expended and whether it was reasonable. Further, my firm represented our client against two parties: your client the plaintiff, as well WOOD & LAMPING LLP

Filed 03/24/2004

Page 3 of 3

Steven A. Goldfarb, Esq. March 23, 2004 Page 2

as cross-claim defendant Cincinnati Travelodge. Thus, much of our fees and costs are irrelevant to the time and money expended in simply defending your client's complaint.

Based on these objections, we do not intend to comply with the subpoena and produce our billing records.

Very truly yours,

ECH/deg 202594.1